

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. In response, applicant has submitted herewith proposed corrections to Figures 2-7.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-68 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Helgeson et al. (US Pub. 2002/0049749). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. In particular, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the subject matter of Claim 2 (or substantially similar language).

The Examiner relies on the following paragraph in Helgeson to make a prior art showing of the following subject matter of Claim 2: "wherein the entering of data includes selectively enabling and disabling the business logic rule via the content page provided by the server."

"[0019] A second Internet-based method is disclosed for implementing a business application using high-level object oriented technology and frameworks, the method providing a client input device having a user interface (UI) wherein the user selects a command and a display device whereby results are displayed, and transmits the command to a server computer hosting a business application management system platform, which includes a WDK Web interface server for receiving the user selected command and for processing a web document that is a custom presentation of information. This second Internet-based method also includes receiving at the client input device a display of results relating to the command, the results obtained by an information distributor server electronically coupled to the WDK Web interface server for generating metadata for a business object, for storing the metadata in a metadata database, for querying the metadata database when asked to do so by a requestor, and for providing the results of a match to a query to the requestor; whereby the business application is available via the internet to assist a user in performing a specific business operation which requires location of and use of business objects and display of results of the specific business operation to the user in a dynamically selectable format."

After careful review of such excerpt as well as the remaining Helgeson reference, applicant notes that Helgeson merely discloses a user interface for selecting a command for processing a web document. Further, examples of

NAIIP279/01.024.01

- 16 -

commands are set forth in the Helgeson disclosure to include cut/copy/paste commands (see paragraph [0556]). In sharp contrast, applicant teaches and claims entering of data that includes “selectively enabling and disabling the business logic rule via the content page provided by the server.”

The Examiner makes a note that applicant’s claim language is met by custom presentation of information. Applicant respectfully disagrees, as it appears that the Examiner is not taking into consideration the full weight of applicant’s claim language.

Specifically, Helgeson fails to disclose, teach or suggest any sort of content page that allows entry of data with the specific capability of selectively enabling and disabling the business logic rule. Instead, Helgeson teaches selection of a command with which processing (not “enabling and disabling”) of a web document (not “a business logic rule”) is carried out.

Only applicant teaches and claims such a unique ability of enabling and disabling the business logic rule in the specific context of the remaining claim limitations.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criteria has simply not been met by the Helgeson reference, for the reasons set forth hereinabove. A specific showing of the foregoing feature or a notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. If any fees

are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P279/01.024.01).

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kevin J. Zilka  
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172  
Telephone: (408) 505-5100

NAI1P279/01.024.01

- 18 -